

Remarks/Arguments:

The pending claims are 1-10. Claims 1-6 have been amended. No new matter is introduced therein.

Paragraph 1 of the Office Action has objected to claim 3. Since claim 3 has been amended, applicants request that this objection be withdrawn.

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action has objected to the Abstract. Since the Abstract has been rewritten, applicants request that this objection be withdrawn.

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action has objected to the Title of the invention. Since the Title has been rewritten, applicants request that this objection be withdrawn.

Applicants have amended Figure 13 to correct typographical errors.

Claims 1-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Horiguchi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,282,507) in view of Miyao et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,774,666). Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 2-6 have been amended so that they are consistent with amended claim 1. The amendment to claim 1 is supported by Figure 15 and the specification describing Figure 15. Amended claim 1 recites, in part:

second extracting/displaying means of, when said selected example is specified,
extracting and displaying candidates of a class which corresponds to contents of
said specified selected example

These features are not shown in either of the cited references.

Page 4 of the Office Action contends that Figure 17 of Horiguchi discloses a second extracting/displaying means. Applicants respectfully disagree. Figure 17 is only another embodiment of the first extracting/displaying means disclosed in Horiguchi. It is not a second extracting/displaying means. Applicants position is supported by the specification in Horiguchi.

First, column 16, lines 46-47 of Horiguchi states that "Fig. 13 is an illustration of one embodiment of a display screen." Second, column 18, line 1 of Horiguchi states that "Fig. 17 shows another embodiment of a display." (emphasis added) Accordingly, Figures 13 and 17 do not disclose first and second displays that may be used concurrently. Instead, they disclose only alternative embodiments of the same display. Accordingly, for this reason alone, amended claim 1 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Horiguchi et al. in view of Miyao.

Page 4 of the Office Action admits that Horiguchi does not disclose that the candidates of a term correspond to contents of the specified selected word string. Page 5 of the Office Action contends that it would have been obvious to substitute the Miyao process for the process described in Figure 17 of Horiguchi. Applicants respectfully disagree for two reasons.

First, Horiguchi and Miyao disclose two different kinds of processes. The Horiguchi invention "relates to a spoken language translation system that performs speech-to-speech translation." (col. 1, lines 9-11). The Miyao invention relates to translation "in which a correct translation is fabricated in cooperation with an operator of the apparatus and the translating apparatus." (col. 1, lines 6-8). The Horiguchi disclosure needs the process described in Figure 17 in order to complete its speech recognition process. That is, the Horiguchi process supports speech recognition by providing words that sound similar to the displayed word. On the other hand, the Miyao process operates by providing synonyms for the displayed word. Substituting Miyao's process for the process described in Horiguchi's Figure 17 would eliminate the critical step in the Horiguchi process of providing alternative sound-alike words for the displayed word. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to make such a substitution because the substitution would destroy the speech recognition process of Horiguchi's Figure 17 process.

Second, claim 1 has been amended, in part, by reciting "extracting and displaying candidates of a class which corresponds to contents of said selected example." (emphasis added). This amendment is supported by, for example, Figure 15 of the application. The term "class" is also supported and explained at least on page 22, lines 9-14 of the specification in connection with the description of Figure 15. The specification states that Fig. 15 shows a specific example of the word class lexicon 1206 that is illustrated in Fig. 12. The term "class" means a word of high abstractness such as fruit. The words belonging to a class are words

which express specific subjects of the class, such as apple and orange. These words belong to the common class, such as "fruit." However, their meanings are very different from each other.

Miyao does not extract and display candidates of a class and does not select words of the same class out of displayed candidates. Instead, Miyao displays synonyms for a selected example. See, column 1, lines 55-56 ("synonyms related to the translated term. . .are displayed."); column 1, lines 66-67; claim 1 at column 11, line 6 and column 12, line 12. A "synonym" is defined as "one of two or more words or expressions of the same language that have the same or nearly the same meaning in some or all senses." Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, Eleventh Dictionary (2003). Miyao provides examples of synonyms at column 1, line 51 to column 2, line 4 where it identifies synonyms for the word "persons." The identified synonyms are "characters," "images," and "portraits."

Amended claim 1, instead, recites "displaying candidates of a class which corresponds to contents of said specified selected example." As shown above, the specification defines "class" as a word of high abstractness. The specification also defines words belonging to a class as "words which express specific subjects of the class." Synonyms do not fit within the definition of class as defined in the specification. Accordingly, Miyao does not teach or suggest "extracting and displaying candidates of a class" as recited in amended claim 1.

Horiguchi also does not extract and display candidates of a class and does not select words of the same class out of displayed candidates. Instead, Horiguchi provides words that sound similar to the displayed word. The possibilities are speech recognition hypotheses. For example, Figure 13 of Horiguchi illustrates that alternative hypotheses for "speech" are "peach," "beach," "preach," and "bleach." None of these words are "candidates of a class which corresponds to contents of said specified selected example" as recited in amended claim 1. Accordingly, Horiguchi does not teach or suggest "extracting and displaying candidates of a class" as recited in amended claim 1.

For all of the above reasons, amended claim 1 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Horiguchi et al. in view of Miyao. Since claims 2-10 depend from amended claim 1, they are also not subject to the same rejection.

Application No.: 10/056,424
Amendment Dated April 22, 2005
Reply to Office Action of January 25, 2005

MTS-3301US

Accordingly, applicants solicit allowance of claims 1-10.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel N. Calder

Daniel N. Calder, Reg. No. 27,424
Stanley Weinberg, Reg. No. 25,276
Attorneys for Applicants

DNC/SW/dmw

Attachments: Figure 13 (1 sheet)
Abstract

Dated: April 22, 2005

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby
authorized to charge payment to Deposit
Account No. 18-0350 of any fees associated
with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited
with the United States Postal Service as first class mail,
with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA
22313-1450 on April 22, 2005.

Donna M. Wellings

Donna M. Wellings

D:\I:\MTS\3301US\AMEND01.DOC

Application No.: 10/056,424
Amendment Dated April 22, 2005
Reply to Office Action of January 25, 2005

MTS-3301US

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 13. This sheet replaces the original sheet.